

Application/Control Number: 10/603246

Art Unit: 2835

Reference to Detailed Action

#### Drawings

I have completed the drawings in accordance to 37CFR 1.83(a), which show all features of the invention specified in the claims.

I have corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37CFR 1.121(d)

#### Specifications

##### Defined

LDC – (Light Emitting Diode) – A small electrical device that generates light when current passes through it.

MCICIA – (Personal Computer Memory Card Industry Association) – A nonprofit industry association that standardized the 16 bit socket allowing portable computers to utilize credit card sized expansion cards.

CDL – This was a misprint. It should have been LDC

#### Claim Objections

I have shown the embodiment in Claims 5 –6 of the dispute of Landry.

I have made the panels slide out, which does not violate other claimed subject matter of Landry. The main point I was conveying is that they are removable, whether knocked out or slid out whereas the term "knocked out" means removable.

What is new in Claims 2-3 is that slide-out panels and slide-out bay fittings can both be interchanged for better fitting. Also, I was trying to show that by having the whole bay slides out, including removable slide-out panels, I can add devices, peripherals, and appliances, which no other subject matter states as part

FROM : EVT

PHONE NO. : 6628384579

Jul. 18 2005 11:22AM P08

PAGE 8/36 \* RCVD AT 7/18/2005 12:16:15 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/27 \* DNIS:2738300 \* CSID:6628384579 \* DURATION (mm-ss):11-38

**THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)**

### Clarification of Claim Rejections

I have restated for clarification my original claim. There is a difference between Landry et al (US6480373) and Wells (US10/603246). Landry and Wells are using the same components, which are used in different ways for different results and usages, but Wells' case functions as a networking and grid computer case with internal component functions in a totally different manner than Landry. Wells case, which is a do it yourself case and wholesale manufacturer's case, is more hobby oriented. Number one, Wells' case is different from his and it expands from the sides, with slide-out panels instead of knockout panels. My understanding of knockout panels is that its general terminology is used for removable panels. However, the panels are removable and the whole housing for the slide-out panels is also removable, and this is different in my approach to Landry. In my use of the word "hybrid", according to my understanding it could also be used to mean a combination of two or more types of computer cases, which means that it can be hybrid, but can be used differently in its approach to being hybrid for old style laptop cases. Whereas my new style will cover electronic equipment, controller boards, also laptop and desktop computers.

There is, also, a difference in the use of his display screens and the ones I am using. The display screens for the case that I am using can be used with a stylus pen and also be networked together or dedicated for a specific use. In Landry's Claims 76 and 115 he speaks of only one keyboard, whereas Wells uses dual to multi-keyboards and a multiple of peripherals, appliances, and controller boards for networking together to function as a whole unit or separate operating units. In the section indicating see column 4, lines 14-24, Claim 4 speaks of the functioning of the heat dissipating system, whereas my system varies in sections of the case's temperature, which is different. My previous understanding is that I had to make the claim broad and not specific, which has also been corrected.

That is why I did not go into detail in the claims. At the time of filing the provisional patent, I was the only one with these claims. One other major feature is that I have several vents, mini-fans and components that split into separate functional components that operate different from Landry's, whereas my case

FROM : EUT

PHONE NO. : 6628384579

Jul. 18 2005 11:22AM P10

components network together and can be controlled. This is not stated in Landry's Claim.  
PAGE 10/36 \* RCVD AT 7/18/2005 12:16:15 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/27 \* DNIS:2738300 \* CSID:6628384579 \* DURATION (mm-ss):11-38

THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)

dissipate heat systems from more than one motherboard and other installed components, including multiple power supplies. My case comprises enclosure vents and mini fans that are networked together in the case. My case is one that separates into separate pieces with physically expandable sides. I have tried to show the different features in my patent that makes it different.

This is, also, solved by corrections of my claims, which differs from Landry's and others.

Lutz does not have a built-in switching system in his case, for the case itself. It does not have three mice for special features, nor does it have a system working singular or networking together as related to mine. Ma does not have a case that networks within itself, nor offers three mice with special functions with multi-displays.

Cho's enclosure mostly deals with mounting a fan, using mounting devices with brackets in portable computers. He does not deal with the mounting of several fans and my mounts are physically different. However, Cho's patent does not demonstrate the physical expandability or receive many different parts for the use of multi-components networked together, nor a third mouse with specialized functions. He, also, uses a system that is physically different to what I am using. My system uses special mounts on the outside to the overall case on the bracket external. I am using a different screw locking system than he is. My system uses notches on the screws to help lock them in. This is different from his. I have rewritten basic claims so that they are clear. The use of the components is similar, but different in their physical operation, placement and appearance. As you requested, I have tried to show prior art, explain its difference in operations or usage.

I have allowed subject matter from prior art of Landry et al. (US6480373), Lutz et al. (US5666265), Ma (US5260885) and Cho (US5969941). I have also put other prior art to account for similar, allowable information.

FROM : EUT

PHONE NO. : 6628384579

Jul. 18 2005 11:23AM P12

PAGE 12/36 \* RCVD AT 7/18/2005 12:16:15 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/27 \* DNIS:2738300 \* CSID:6628384579 \* DURATION (mm-ss):11-38

**THIS PAGE BLANK (USPTO)**